

Appl. No. : 10/644,179
Amdt. Dated: September 24, 2007
Reply to Office Action of July 27, 2007

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 24 2007

REMARKS

Claims 11-16, 18, 20-22 and 24 stand rejected. Claims 11, 16 and 21 have been amended herein. Claim 23 has been allowed. Therefore, claims 11-16, 18, 20-24 are pending while claims 11-16, 18, 20-22 and 24 are at issue.

As an initial matter, the Office Action indicates on page 7 that claim 23 has been allowed. Furthermore, none of the rejections detailed in the Office Action include reference to claim 23 being rejected. However, in the Office Action summary, the Examiner has not indicated that claim 23 was allowed, and in fact, indicated that claim 23 is rejected. Applicant believes that claim 23 should be indicated to be allowed in the Office Action summary. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests clarification regarding claim 23.

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicant has amended claim 16 to recite "wherein at least one of the attachment portions..." Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 11-14, 16 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Mason et al. This rejection should be withdrawn as Mason et al. fails to disclose or suggest one or more features recited in independent claim 11, as amended. Specifically, claim 11 has been amended to more clearly recite that the attachment portions project laterally inwardly, as suggested by the Examiner. Claim 11 has been amended to recite that the bottom wall and the peripheral wall define a drawer space and that the attachment portions project laterally inwardly from the respective base portions toward the drawer space.

This structure is simply not found in Mason et al. Instead, Mason et al., at best, discloses an alleged attachment portion projecting outwardly and upwardly away from the drawer space.

Appl. No. : 10/644,179

Amdt. Dated: September 24, 2007

Reply to Office Action of July 27, 2007

Referring to Figure 1 of Mason et al., it can be readily seen that the alleged attachment portion 34 projects up and away (outwardly) from the drawer space. Therefore, as Mason et al. fails to disclose or suggest one or more features recited in independent claim 11, the rejection should be withdrawn. Additionally, the rejection of dependent claims 12-14, 16 and 20 should also be withdrawn for the same reason.

Claims 21-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Mason et al. This rejection should also be withdrawn for similar reasons to those presented above with respect to claim 11. Specifically, independent claim 21 has been amended similarly to claim 11 to more clearly recite that the attachment portion projects from the base portions toward the drawer space. As presented *supra*, Mason et al. does not disclose this feature as the alleged attachment portion 34 projects up and away from the drawer space. Therefore, as Mason et al. fails to disclose or suggest one or more features recited in independent claim 21, as well as dependent claim 22, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 20 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hansen et al. in view of Owen and further in view of Abernathy et al. However, this rejection should be withdrawn as the cited references, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the structure recited in claim 11, as amended.

As discussed *supra*, claim 11 has been amended to recite that the bottom wall and the peripheral wall define a drawer space and that the attachment portions project laterally inwardly from the respective base portions toward the drawer space. Hansen et al. does not disclose or suggest this structure, but instead, at best, discloses attachment portions (dovetails) that extend outwardly and away from the drawer space. Owen and Abernathy add nothing in this regard.

Appl. No. : 10/644,179
Amdt. Dated: September 24, 2007
Reply to Office Action of July 27, 2007


Therefore, as the cited references, when taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the recited structure, the rejection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action also cites Abernathy alleging that the reference discloses a projection 11 on the wall extending substantially parallel to the rear surface of the wall. However, claim 11 recites the alleged structure as being located on a front panel to slidably receive the attachment portions of the drawer body. The structure cited by the Office Action is actually a guide structure for inserting a drawer into a chassis and not the recited front panel and drawer. Therefore, for this additional reason, the rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests clarification of the status of claim 23, entry of the present amendment, reconsideration of the rejection of the claims and allowance of the case. If any fees are due in connection with this application, the Patent Office is authorized to deduct the fees from Deposit Account No. 19-1351. If such withdrawal is made, please indicate the attorney docket number (25493-457390) on the account statement.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Joseph H. Herron
PTO Reg. No. 53,019
Seyfarth Shaw LLP
Attorneys for Assignee
131 South Dearborn Street
Suite 2400
Chicago, Illinois 60603-5577
312-460-5000
312-460-7000 (fax)